

Appl. No. 09/669,396  
Amdt. dated July 19, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of May 26, 2004

### REMARKS

In the Office Action dated May 26, 2004, the application was indicated as being in condition for allowance except for various formal matters, including an issue of new matter with respect to Figures 3C, 3D, 4A, and 4B submitted with the previous Reply to Office Action. The Office Action also objected to the specification and claim 1.

Claims 1, 11, and 14 have been amended to address minor formal matters. The scope of each of claims 1, 11, and 14 remain unchanged by the amendments.

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments made to the specification and Figures 3C, 3D, 4A, and 4B in the previous Reply to Office Action do not constitute new matter. The addition of the multiplexor 365 and processor 366 into Figures 3C, 3D, 4A, and 4B are supported by the specification (pages 19 and 20) and by claim 17 as originally filed. In the previous Reply to Office Action, the paragraph on page 19, starting at line 18, of the specification was amended by adding reference numerals 363 (corresponding to the processor) and 365 (corresponding to the multiplexor). Clearly, the addition of reference numerals does not constitute new matter, as such reference numerals merely constitute labels for elements already described by the specification.

The paragraph on page 19, starting at line 18, describes multiplexing routing table address inputs such that the routing table address inputs can be written by a processor. As further stated by the paragraph, "[t]he routing table is thereby addressable by either the address generated by the hash function or functions, or by an address generated by the processor." Thus, this paragraph clearly provides support for multiplexing of outputs of a processor and a hash function and providing the result of such multiplexing to the routing table. Original claim 17, which is part of the original disclosure of the specification of the present application, refers to a multiplexor that is "capable of selecting a RAM address from the group of addresses comprising an address generated by the processor and the address generated by the hash function." Thus, claim 17, as originally filed, also supports the addition of the processor and multiplexor made in Figures 3C, 3D, 4A, and 4B. As stated by the MPEP, "[i]f subject matter capable of illustration is originally claimed and it is not shown in the drawing, the claim *is not rejected* but applicant is


Appl. No. 09/669,396  
Amdt. dated July 19, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of May 26, 2004

required to add it to the drawing." MPEP § 706.03(o) (8<sup>th</sup> ed., Rev. 2) at 700-69 to 700-70. "In establishing a disclosure, Applicant may rely not only on the specification and drawing as filed but also on the original claims if their content justifies it." MPEP § 608.04, at 600-112. In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the changes made to the figures and the specification in the previous Reply to Office Action do not constitute new matter.

Withdrawal of the objections to the drawings and specification based on new matter is respectfully requested. Allowance of all claims of the present application is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, including extension of time fees, and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 (200308239-1).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 19, 2004



---

Dan C. Hu, Reg. No. 40,025  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Ph]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]